

**Sri H. C. LINGA REDDY** (Minister of State for Ports and Fisheries).—

	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69 (31-3-1969)
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Sales Tax	57,646-54	2,00,415-84	89,785-07
Oct — " —	9,660-00	23,547-00	9,922-00
	<hr/> 67,306-54	<hr/> 2,23,962-84	<hr/> 99,707-07

### **Suspension of Sri Vatal Nagaraj—Termination of Period of —**

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—I have to place before this hon. House the letter of unqualified apology addressed to me by the hon. Member Sri Vatal Nagaraj. He has expressed his sincere regret and offered apology for his conduct. Therefore, it is up to the hon. Members to move a resolution for the termination of the suspension order.

**Sri K. PUTTASWAMY** (Minister for Law, Labour and Parliamentary Affairs).—Sir, under Proviso to Rule 309 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly, I move:

“That the suspension of hon. Member Sri Vatal Nagaraj be terminated.”

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—The question is:

“That the suspension of hon. Member Sri Vatal Nagaraj be terminated.”

*The motion was adopted.*

### **Fifth Finance Commission—Recommendation of**

**Sri M. NAGAPPA** (Raichur).—I have sent an adjournment motion regarding the recent publication of the Report of the Fifth Finance Commission. It is reported that the share of the Mysore Government has been reduced to the extent of Rs. 18 crores. As it is an urgent and important matter affecting the finances of our State for five years, I request the Hon. Chair to give priority to the discussion of the subject and allow me immediately. The prosperity of this State depends to a large extent on the allocations made by the Commission. We are entitled to a huge sum and a greater share. In this matter, it seems that the State Government has not properly represented Mysore's case, because

under the present Award the State's share is very much less than that given under the Fourth Finance Commission's recommendation. This is a crucial matter which has to be taken into consideration without any loss of time.

Sri N. A. CHANNE Gowda (Srirangapatna).—I have asked the Chair to raise a 2½ hours' discussion on the reported recommendation of the Fifth Finance Commission which has reduced our share by Rs. 18 crores. The Fifth Finance Commission has taken into consideration the population and the *per capita* income of the State, which is not fair. On account of this reduced allocation, the developmental activities of the State will be hit hard. Therefore, the Chair should grant permission for raising discussion immediately.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಬಹಿ. ಎಸ್. ನಂಜುಗೌಡ (ಅರಕರ್ ಗೊಡು).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರವರೇ ಮಹಾಶಯ ಅಮ್ಮೋಗದವರು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಶಿವಾರ್ಪಣ ಅಂಶಗಳ ಸಂದಿ ನೆಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಡುವ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಕಟವಾಗಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೂ ಹಾಗೂ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಪ್ರಜೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಮನಸ್ಸು ಬಹಳವಾಗಿ ಕಂಪಿತವಾಗಿದೆ. ಹೋದವರ್ಷದ ಶಿವಾರ್ಪಣಂತ ಈ ವರ್ಷದ ಶಿವಾರ್ಪಣಕ್ಕೆ 18 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮೊರೆ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಬಹು ಬಹಳ ದುಃಖವಾಯಿತು ಎಂದು ನಂತರ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೆನಿಸಿದುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ತಿಳಿಯಲು ಬಹಳ ಕಾತರರಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಹಂಚಾಣಿ ಅಮ್ಮೋಗದವರು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಶಿವಾರ್ಪಣ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ತಲುಪಿದೆಯೇ? ಹಾಗೆ ಅದು ಬಂದು ತೀರ್ಪಾಗುವುದನ್ನು ಬಯಸಿದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುವುದನ್ನು ಅವನು ಅ ಶಿವಾರ್ಪಣನ್ನು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೂ ಅವಕಾಶ ಇರುವುದೇ? ಮೈಸೂರು ರಾಜ್ಯ ಈ ವರ್ಷ 18 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಕಳೆದ ವರ್ಷದ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿನವರ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಅದೇನು ಬಂದು ತಿಳಿಯುವುದು? ಮತ್ತೆ ಛೇದವಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಇದೆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ಬಹು ಮನವರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಈತನು ದೋಷ. ತಾವು ಇದರ ಬೆರ್ಚಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೋರಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

†Sri D. B. KALMANKAR (Aland).—I have also given notice of an adjournment motion regarding the Fifth Finance Commission's recommendations. We are very saddened to see that while the Fourth Commission had given about Rs. 215 crores, the Fifth Commission has slashed it down to about Rs. 197 crores in the divisible pool of taxes and grants-in-aid. So, the matter is very urgent since all other States have been benefited by the Commission's recommendations. They have all got more. So this House should discuss the matter and focus the attention of the Central Government on the invidious distinction made between this State and others and impress on them that gross injustice has been done to this State. As this matter requires utmost and immediate attention, other business of the House may be adjourned and this subject may be taken up for consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now I want to hear the Hon. Finance Minister on the points raised by the members. I wish particularly to be enlightened whether this State Government has received the Fifth Finance Commission's recommendations.

Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE (Minister for Finance, Excise and Youth Welfare).—Sir, I fully share the anxiety and concern of the Hon. Members about the recommendations of the Fifth Finance Commission,

(SRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE)

as reported in the newspapers. So far, we have not received any official communication in this behalf. My information is also based on what has been published in newspapers. Therefore, I do not want to make any statement at this juncture. But on the basis of the impression created by the Press report, I must say, if that is correct, that Mysore State has received a very raw deal from the Fifth Finance Commission; it is really not only surprising but shocking, to see that this is the only State which has received less financial assistance, as compared with the Fourth Finance Commission's recommendations.

At this moment I am not in a position to enlighten the hon. Members on this subject any more. Let us wait until we receive the official communication. I may also inform hon. Members that Chief Minister has sent a very strongly worded telegram yesterday protesting against the reported treatment that has been given to Mysore.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Harihar).—When do you expect to get a copy of the report?

Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE.—In a few days we may get it. Actually, we have already tried to get a copy of the Fifth Finance Commission's report.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಎಸ್. ಅರಕೇರಿ.—ನಾನು ಅರ್ಧ ಗಂಟೆ ಕಾಲದ ಜರ್ಜರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಮೋಟೋ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಐದಾರು ದಿನಗಳಾದುವು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಈವರೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I share the anxiety of the hon. Members regarding the alleged raw deal meted out to the State by the Fifth Finance Commission. But it is not correct to comment upon that unless a full report is available. Sometimes it happens that the information supplied may be incomplete. Therefore, unless there is definite matter which can be discussed on the floor of the House, it becomes difficult for me to give consent to any of the notices given by the hon. Members. After a copy of the report is received by the Government, I hope the Government will make available all the information to the hon. Members. If hon. Members feel that any discussion on the subject is necessary, I will be very glad to afford an opportunity to hon. Members to discuss it. As it is, since there is no specific matter, I am sorry I cannot give my consent to the notices.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—The apprehension we have in our mind is, if the report is not received before the session ends, and if we re-assemble after six months, then the Speaker may say that it is not a matter of recent occurrence and so we will not be in a position to discuss it. May I know whether the Government would assure that they would call a session of the Assembly to discuss it on the floor of the House?

**SRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE.**—I can only say that at the earliest possible opportunity I would like to place the gist of the report before the House. But, unless we receive a copy, it is not possible for me to place it before the House. In regard to the question raised, I do not think it is possible to give an assurance that in case the report is not received before the adjournment of the House, a special session will be convened. I do not know what will be the utility of discussing the recommendations of the Fifth Finance Commission on the floor of the House except that we can express our strong views and feelings to be conveyed to the Government of India.

**SRI K. H. PATIL (Hubli).**—We can talk for and against it.

**SRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE.**—If it is in favour, the views cannot be obviously very strong. If it has gone against, we can make the case as strong as possible.

### Notice of a question of privilege against "Daily Azad."

**MR. SPEAKER.**—Sri M. Nagappa had tabled a privilege motion against the Editor of Daily Azad. I have received an apology letter, dated 25th August 1969 from the Editor, Daily Azad, I shall read it for the information of the House :

"With reference to your letter No. 4668/LA, dated 23rd August 1969 calling our attention to the caption in our views in the matter, we write to state that what is actually intended to be conveyed in the caption in question is 'Three S. S. P. Members were suspended for the rest of the day' and not "from the service of the house for the remainder of the current session of the Legislative Assembly ". This is also clearly evidenced from the words occurring in the said column, viz., 'three members were suspended from the rest of the work of the Assembly for one day.' For the words 'ordered to withdraw', the word 'suspended' has been used in the Urdu translation. The caption read with the news item does not in any way imply that the members were suspended for the remainder of the current session of the Legislative Assembly. However, it is highly regretted that the caption in question has given room for misinterpretation, for which we apologise.

Necessary correction has also been published in our Paper of 25th August 1969, a copy of which is sent herewith for kind information."

In view of the reply, I believe the hon. member will not press his motion.